

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 ROBERT CRAIG,

No. 2:04-cv-2740-MCE-DAD-P

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

ORDER

14 TOM CAREY, et al.,

15 Respondents.
16 _____/

17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed
18 this application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28
19 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States
20 Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local
21 General Order No. 262.

22 On January 17, 2006, the magistrate judge filed Findings and
23 Recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which
24 contained notice to all parties that any Objections to the
25 Findings and Recommendations were to be filed within twenty (20)
26 days.

1 Petitioner has filed Objections to the Findings and
2 Recommendations.

3 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C.
4 § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this Court has conducted a
5 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the
6 entire file, the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to
7 be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

9 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed January 17, 2006,
10 are adopted in full;

11 2. Respondents' April 21, 2005 Amended Motion to Dismiss is
12 granted; and

13 3. This action is dismissed with prejudice because the
14 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus was filed beyond the one year
15 statute of limitations.

16 DATED: March 1, 2006

17
18 
19

20 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26